

This amendment provides two changes to the Fort Meade RFQ and provides “answers to Relevant Questions Received by the Contracting Officer” as listed below. Text additions, deletions, and changes to the RFQ are in red and their locations are indicated by a vertical line in the right margin. All other terms and conditions of the RFQ remain unchanged. The Fort Meade RFQ as amended is provided as an Adobe Acrobat “.pdf” file on the Internet Website <http://rci.army.mil>. This facilitates printing replacement pages to update an existing RFQ or printing a new updated RFQ.

Change 1. Part 1, page 9, paragraph 3.3, “Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Scoring” (second paragraph) is changed to correct the reference to the RFQ Section on “(Financial Return).”

3.3. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Scoring
[the first paragraph remains unchanged]

Section 4.5.⁶⁵ below (Financial Return) outlines the relationship between OMB scoring and the Army's evaluation of developers' proposals. Accordingly, the effect of OMB scoring should be taken into account when considering how best to leverage the Army's assets at Fort Meade. If, for example, the Army agrees to pay differential lease payments to a developer for 10 years, the Army must, prior to Phase 2 implementation, obligate funds equal to the amount of the differential payment to be made over the 10-year period. Consequently, in their proposals developers should attempt to maximize total resources available for the Fort Meade project while minimizing the effect of OMB scoring on the Army's commitment of assets.

Change 2. Part 1, Page 15, paragraph “4.3.4, Organizational Capabilities,” is modified to clarify the requirement to indicate proof of legal jurisdiction and standing.

4.3.4 Organizational Capabilities [ref., the third bulleted paragraph]

- The legal jurisdiction under which the firm is organized and operating- by submitting the proof of existence as an established legal entity, providing a proper Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number, and providing a Commercial and Government Entity (CAGE) code with the submission. Developers must be registered with the Department of Defense Central Contractor Registry, which can be accomplished through <http://www.ccr2000.com>.

**Answers to Relevant Questions
Received by the Contracting Officer**

1. QUESTION: The RFQ requires that Statement of Qualifications be submitted electronically as a Microsoft Word Document. May we include required financial statements and graphics in either .jpg or .pdf format?

ANSWER: No, Section 1.2.2 of the RFQ states that all submissions must be in MS Word.

2. QUESTION: On page 10 under Section 4.1 (Information Request Instructions- Statement of Qualifications) the RFQ for Ft. Meade states the "resumes requested under Section 4.3.6" are not included in the 50-page limit. Section 4.3.6 (Past Performance) asks for trade references for our 5 "showcased" projects asked for in Section 4.3.1. Resumes of key team members are asked for under Section 4.3.4 (Organizational Capabilities). I'm assuming that this is a typographical error and that it is the key team members' resumes requested in Section 4.3.4 that are not included in the 50-page limit and NOT the contact information for the five relevant projects asked for in Section 4.3.6.

ANSWER: This has been corrected by amendment 1; see the <http://rci.army.mil> website.

3. QUESTION: In order to meet the minimum qualifications, a principal member of the proposer [offeror] must have served as the primary developer with an "ownership interest." The definition of "ownership interest" in Appendix F states that the developer must have contributed cash or "other equity" to the referenced project.

a. Does "other equity" include funds contributed from a company's working capital?

b. Must the "ownership interest" exist at the time of proposal submission, or does a prior ownership interest qualify?

c. So long as the project meets the minimum qualifications, does it matter if the project is an interval ownership resort, such as a timeshare property?

ANSWER: a. Initial and subsequent funds contributed from a firm into a project will be considered equity contributions to the project.

ANSWER: b. Ownership interest from a principal member of a project team does **NOT** have to exist at the time of submission; but extent and duration indicated.

ANSWER: c. "Single-firm developer" or "principal member in a development team" minimum qualifications requirements in 4.2 Minimum Experience are applicable to the qualifications in 4.3 and relate to Evaluation Factors in 4.5 Experience. All projects submitted will be considered within these RFQ requirements.

4. QUESTION: Regarding the minimum qualifications and the requirement for total development costs in excess of \$30 million, must the development costs be expressed in actual (i.e. un[non]-inflated) dollars? Is it acceptable to inflate historical total development costs to current dollars using a commonly accepted inflation factor, like the CPI?

ANSWER: It is acceptable to inflate historical total development costs to current dollars using a commonly accepted inflation factor; the source of the factor should be provided in the Statement of Qualification submission.

5. QUESTION: Regarding qualifications experience and the information requested for the "five most recent projects relevant to the Ft. Meade initiative," we take "most recent" to include projects that the development team principal member currently owns and manages, even if the projects were constructed decades ago (which demonstrates successful long term ownership and management of rental housing). Is this assumption correct? Does a time limit exist for "recent" projects? If yes, how is that time limit defined?

ANSWER: Your assumption was correct. However, it is the task and responsibility of the offeror to define what they feel is relevant to the Fort Meade initiative and then just give us the 5 most recent examples. The more recent a particular activity occurs, be it management, development, construction or other, the more it demonstrates current skill in that activity.

6. QUESTION: Is there a minimum threshold of net worth the Army is seeking to be demonstrated in submitted audited financial statements?

ANSWER: The Army is seeking a development partner that demonstrates a strong financial structure through the audited financial statements, however, there is no minimum net worth requirement presented in the RFQ; but this is considered in evaluations.

7. QUESTION: Do Davis-Bacon wage rates apply to the construction contract?

ANSWER: Phase one of this contract does not involve Davis-Bacon (DB) wages rates because this phase is to develop a CDMP under a firm fixed price service contract. The issue of the DB wage rates will be addressed during the CDMP development.

8. QUESTION: The problem is actually with the proposal itself. There are a number of pages with maps that are not being read by the software program - perhaps the maps are in a different software format and that is where the problems lies. Had a outside consultant download the RFQ and he had same problem. When printing the document it always stops at the same map page. We finally figured a way to bypass the problem but the problem still remains - the maps are not set up to be read by the software program.

ANSWER: The problem has been experienced by others, but has been due to technical problems at the receiving end. Often the problem is a low speed modem connection, high internet traffic times, and the receiving computer having memory resources over accessed by other programs residing in resident memory while downloading. Please consult your automation technical advisor or Internet Service Provider (ISP), or both.

9. QUESTION: With respect to the Ft. Meade RFQ, can concept plan (renderings) be larger than 8 1/2 x 11? Can they be ledger size and tri-folded?

ANSWER: You must follow the prescribed requirements in the RFQ.

10. QUESTION: Section 1.1.2 Submission of Statement of Qualifications (page 3) of the Request for Qualifications states "...The Statement of Qualifications and required representations must be produced in Microsoft Word, 8½" x 11" format using 12-point type in the Arial font..." Certain charts and tables, i.e., conceptual land use plan, will not be legible in the 8½"x11" format. Is it acceptable to use an 11"x17" format for the hard copies and electronic MSWord submission?

ANSWER: You must follow the prescribed requirements in the RFQ.

11. QUESTION: We would like to offer our services [residential inspections] and hope you include them in the solicitation for MFHI [MHPI] and maintenance SOW [scope of work].

ANSWER: Residential inspections are one of many aspects that will be involved in the RCI project. However, this service will be performed by the selected developer for this project. You may joint venture with other firms for our RCI project, market your firm with those responding to the RCI solicitation, or wait until after the project is awarded and market your services to the selected developer. See the <http://rci.army.mil> website list of attendees to the industry forum for potential contacts.

12. QUESTION: Is the 50 page limit inclusive of the table of contents and a content table relating to tables and graphs included in the document? Does the 50 page limit also include the "Offer" Page.

ANSWER: RFQ Section 4.1 "Information Request Instructions – Statement of Qualifications" addresses this issue; e.g., the last portion of the paragraph.

13. QUESTION:

- a. How many vacancies are there at present out of the 2,862 units on base today. Does this number include the 250 apartment units vacated at Old Meade heights?
- b. Can the Old Meade Heights structures be preserved and renovated, assuming that asbestos and lead based paint issues are addressed?
- c. Has an environmental assessment of the Old Meade Heights building been performed?
- d. Does all new or revitalized housing under the RCI have to be "inside the gates", i.e. no units like Meade Heights?
- e. Assuming that there are asbestos and lead based paint problems in many more units than just Old Meade Heights, have those assessments been performed? Can we have access to unoccupied units in each village for our environmental assessment contractor to make inspections?
- f. Are there disposal site options for the asbestos and lead based paint demolition materials on base or do they have to be disposed of privately?

ANSWER: a. As of 26 May 00, there were 710 vacant units. Yes, the 250 units at "Old Meade Hts" are included in the 710 count.

ANSWER: b. Yes, the units at "Old Meade Hts" could be renovated. However, the installation prefers to have the units demolish and replace on a clear site on the installation proper (inside the fence). Additionally, the units do not meet county code.

ANSWER: c. No. The Environmental Assessment was not conducted on "Old Meade Hts" since it was the installation's intention to remove those units and replace elsewhere on the installation.

ANSWER: d. No. However, the installation prefers to have all new units built inside the installation.

ANSWER: e. Last asbestos survey was conducted in 1990. –The last lead based paint assessment was conducted in 1997.

ANSWER: f. Disposal of materials containing asbestos and lead based paint must be disposed at a hazardous material disposal site off-post.

14. QUESTION: Regarding Section 4.3.6 on page 16 of the Fort Meade RFQ, we are asked to "list all instances of litigation or formal Alternative Dispute Resolution processes...to which your firm has been a party." Does this include all minor legal actions such as a slip-and-fall case or one particular case where a company truck was involved in a minor traffic accident? While we have no instances involving a claim over \$500,000, as a large, successful and well-known property manager and construction company, we have any number of minor suits (the vast majority of which are dismissed) in any given year. This is an unfortunate reality for a large, diverse company in an industry such as ours. Instead can the concept of materiality be used as a benchmark for listing any pertinent litigation?

ANSWER: Please follow the RFQ Section 4.3.6 "Past Performance," third bulleted paragraph "List all instances of litigation or formal Alternative Dispute Resolution processes...to which your firm has been a party."

15. QUESTION: According to the RFQ, the developer will be responsible for utility costs up to that determined to be a "reasonable amount" allocated from BAH. In addition to standard costs for gas and electric, will utility costs included in this "reasonable amount" also include trash collection, water & sewer?

ANSWER: Yes.

16. QUESTION: I became aware of this RFQ after the industry [Forum] presentation. Therefore, how and when can I visit the site and obtain additional information?

ANSWER: Your name has been forwarded for inclusion on the list on the <http://rci.army.mil> website.

17. QUESTION: Much of what is presented for this proposal is in table format. Can tables have a font of less than 12 point?

ANSWER: Please follow the information in the RFQ Section 1.2.2 "Submission of Statement of Qualification."

18. QUESTION: According to the RFQ, the developer will be responsible for utility costs up to that determined to be a "reasonable amount" allocated from BAH. In addition to standard costs for gas and electric, will utility costs included in this "reasonable amount" also include trash collection, water & sewer?

ANSWER: Water and sewer would be included but not trash collection.

19. QUESTION:

a. Does Table B-1 represent the assignments and monthly rent **assuming** full occupancy? If it takes into account the quarters not occupied in Old Fort Meade Heights, is the total number of quarters (occupied and unoccupied) different from 2,862?

b. In Appendix D, page D-4, Paragraph 2.0, second paragraph of the RFQ for the Fort Meade project, it appears to say that such a reinvestment of net income in the project will be considered as "equity". Is this correct?

c. In many other business structures, excess dollars (e.g., net profit) flow to developers who then may consider "equity" contributions to the project. In a not for profit structure, this is not the case. Do such substantial net earnings of a not for profit created for the sole purpose of supporting a developer's efforts concerning the Fort Meade housing project "count" as "equity" contributions for such a prospective developer when using such a not for profit structure in lieu of a more conventional business structure?

ANSWER: a. Table B-1 is an indication of the monthly rental income that a developer could receive if all of the existing 2,862 quarters were occupied, based

on BAH rates. The 250 units in Old Meade Heights are included in the 2,862 total.

ANSWER: b. Private sector participation as outlined in Appendix D, Paragraph 2.0 does not equate to private sector equity. The two terms, participation and equity, are not synonymous.

ANSWER: c. No.

20. QUESTION:

a. Will a request for Army "gap" financing be viewed negatively in the RFQ selection process?

b. Will the scored amount of funds requested for "gap" financing be a factor in the selection process?

c. If so, how will the amount be evaluated and weighted against other elements of the proposed project (i.e., long term reinvestment in the units, quality of construction, number of existing units replaced, etc.)?

ANSWER: a. Yes. If the Army finances any part of the deal, the amount will be scored. If the Army had to choose between equal submissions, one requiring gap financing, and one that did not request Army "gap" financing, the choice would clearly be the one which mitigates the most risk.

ANSWER: b. See response to question #1.

ANSWER: c. As stated in the RFQ the evaluation factor which addresses the financial capability is the third factor. The evaluation factors are in descending order of importance, which means that experience and preliminary concept are of greater importance than financial capability.

21. QUESTION: Is it safe to assume that all utilities will be privatized?

ANSWER: See Page A-5 of the RFQ, which states that Fort Meade is in the process of privatizing its utility plants and distribution systems. You may also visit the document room for additional information.

22. QUESTION: Will the housing units be individually metered?

ANSWER: The metering will be addressed as part of the utilities issues and determined during CDMP development.

23. QUESTION: Will military tenants pay residential rates directly to the utility provider, or will the developer be responsible for utilities up to the "reasonable amount?"

ANSWER: The details of utilities payments will be agreed upon during development of the CDMP. However, the RFQ Section 3.2 "Other Provisions and Considerations," paragraph on "**Utilities**" (page 9) makes it clear that the developer will be responsible for utility costs up to that determined to be the "reasonable amount." Utilities cost will include all costs allocated from BAH for housing units occupied by military personnel or their families, and all costs of utilities provided to common areas of the project and to any housing units covered by the project which are not occupied by military personnel or their families. For housing units occupied by non-military personnel or their families, the developer may expect to recover some or all the costs of utilities from the occupants.

24. QUESTION: If one or more systems are not privatized, will the Army provide the utility to the housing areas?

ANSWER: The Army will continue to provide any utility service to the housing areas if, for some reason, that utility service is not privatized.

25. QUESTION: If one or more systems are not privatized, at what cost will the Army provide the utility to the housing areas? At what cost?

ANSWER: The details of this will be determined during the development of the CDMP. If you are interested in knowing the historical utilities cost of the housing areas, the document room may have information that would be helpful to you.

26. Will the BAH (revenue) increase be based on some benchmark tied to operating costs, like the CPI, or will it increase based on Congressional appropriations?

ANSWER: Revisions to the BAH rate are done on a continual basis and are based on market surveys and other indicators of the local housing market, but are subject to Congressional approval. For more information on the BAH system, refer to this website <<http://www.dtic.mil/perdiem/bah.html>>.

27. QUESTION: Will the Army pay for military family moving costs or is the developer responsible?

ANSWER: The Army will continue to pay as usual for moving military families. If a military family makes a move that would not be covered by the Army, the developer would not be responsible for the cost of that move.

28. QUESTION: Is the Army willing to include recreational assets (golf course, theater, bowling center) in the transaction?

ANSWER: Please refer to page 5 of the RFQ for information regarding the collaboration within the Army and the community that must take place prior to authorizing a developer to construct and operate any ancillary supporting facilities that relate to the family housing community and complement business operations in the local community.

29. QUESTION: Will the developer be required to take ownership and operational responsibility for the youth center, child development center or any other similar facilities?

ANSWER: No.

30. QUESTION: Will proposed ancillary supporting facilities that compete with existing AAFES, MWR or DeCA facilities be allowed?

ANSWER: No. However, the offeror may propose ancillary supporting facilities that might otherwise compete with existing AAFES, MWR or DeCA facilities, if the Board of Directors having jurisdiction of the effected agency approves the plans.

31. QUESTION: How and when will this determination be made?

ANSWER: See the paragraph under Section 2.1.1 CDMP Development Plan" (page 5) of the RFQ; "To further the Army's goals at Fort Meade..." -- If the developer proposes an ancillary supporting facility which competes with the existing AAFES, MWR or DeCA facilities, the Army will not authorize it.

32. QUESTION: Will proposals that meet "local standards" but do not meet MILCON standards be viewed less favorably than those that adhere to MILCON standards?

ANSWER: The Army is looking for quality construction. MILCON standards are not required. If one submission proposes to provide a higher quality of standard than another, does, the higher quality would receive a more favorable evaluation.

33. QUESTION: Do "local standards" include multi-family dwellings?

ANSWER: Yes.

34. QUESTION: Will local building codes apply?

ANSWER: Yes, but see Appendix A, **"2.1 Installation Building Guidelines"**, page A-6 of the RFQ.

35. QUESTION: Is the developer or the housing office responsible for referring military households to privatized housing?

ANSWER: Whether the developer or the Army housing office refer military members to privatized housing remains to be determined during development of the CDMP.

36. QUESTION: At what point will non-military renters be allowed in privatized housing?

ANSWER: Together with the developer during the CDMP, the Army expects to establish a priority order of assignment much like that in the Army Regulation 210-50. In effect, the likely priority order will be military members, military retirees, DoD civilian employees, DoD-affiliated civilians, then general public. Remains to be determined during the CDMP, but see AR 210-4, re: only after all DoD service member, all DoD civilians, etc.

37. QUESTION: Is there a minimum vacancy (for example 5%) threshold for military renters that must be exceeded before non-military tenants are allowed?

ANSWER: This remains to be determined during development of the CDMP. There is not currently such a minimum vacancy threshold policy.

38. QUESTION: Will non-military tenants pay market rent or BAH-based rent?

ANSWER: The non-military tenants will likely pay market rent but again this will be determined during the development of the CDMP.

39. QUESTION: Who has jurisdiction in the housing areas (exclusive federal, concurrent, proprietary)?

ANSWER: See page A-6 of the RFQ which states that Fort Meade will maintain exclusive federal jurisdiction over all the real estate within the borders of the installation.

40. QUESTION: Can non-military tenants be restricted in accessing the base?

ANSWER: Arrangements for access to the base by non-military tenants during times of a heightened security tightening will be addressed during the build of the CDMP.

41. QUESTION: What will the SB, SDB, WO goals be for the Fort Meade privatization project?

ANSWER: The Small Business (SB), Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB), and Women-owned Business (WO) goals for the Fort Meade privatization project are not for public knowledge during the solicitation. However, an offeror's experience with SB, SDB, and WO concerns, as well as, an offeror's goals and plans to achieve those goals are a specific evaluation factor for selection of the best developer for the project, see RFQ sections 4.3.7 and 4.5.7.

42. QUESTION: Would you please forward a copy of the speaker slides from the industry Forum.

ANSWER: The Industry Forum presentations are not available in electronic form. Be advised, the Industry Forum was informational and not an official RCI procurement event/function. Offerors should rely strictly on the Fort Meade RFQ for matters pertaining to competing for the Fort Meade RCI project.

43. QUESTION: Will the Family Housing Improvements (DACA02-00-R-0002) include window replacement? If so, who should I contact about specs, etc?

ANSWER: There is a potential that windows will be replaced by the developer selected. An approach to contact about spec, etc., would be to periodically access our <http://rci.army.mil> website for the award announcement and direct your questions to the selected developer.

44. QUESTION: Is it possible to get a list of the private sector developers that have responded to your solicitation for the above referenced project? We are a large supplier and would like to send information on our products to these contractors.

ANSWER: Yes, a list of offerors for the project may be obtained on request after the project is awarded. A source of the firms expressing interest in the RCI program is available from the Industry Forum attendees list, see the <http://rci.army.mil>

45. QUESTION:

- a. Have the Fort Hood and Fort Lewis RCI developers been selected yet? If so, who are the selected developers?
- b. Will proposals that include privatization of Unaccompanied Personnel Housing (UPH) be considered in the Fort Meade RCI developer selection?

ANSWER: a. One award has been made on the Fort Hood project at the time of preparing this response. When awards are made, they will be announced by CBD and the <http://rci.army.mil> website.

ANSWER: b. The RFQ for Ft. Meade RCI project is for family housing [accompanied personnel] for which the parameters are contained in the RFQ.

46. QUESTION: Paragraph 4.3.2 (page 13). Reinvestment in property owned or leased for 50 years is an understood concept. Please explain the Army's rationale for returning revenue to the Army for reinvestment into the overall RCI program.

ANSWER: The Army is seeking a partner who will optimize the available funds over the life of the project. We are not suggesting one particular course of action over another, we are describing components of the preliminary concept vision statement which may or may not be used in your submission. Preliminary concept statements will be evaluated in part on the plan for reinvestment.

47. QUESTION: Paragraph 4.2 (page 10/11). Can the collective experience of two or three principal members of the development team be used to meet the paragraph 1 and 2 requirement, or must a single principal member have completed three such development projects and another (or the same) single principal member managed three projects?

ANSWER: A single principal member must have completed three such development projects and another (or the same) single principal member managed three projects (same projects or different).

48. QUESTION: Paragraph 4.1 (page 10); for bidding Phase I, does a "development team" of two or three different organizations have to formally incorporate a legal entity at the time the Statement of Qualifications is submitted, or is a commitment to legally form a single business entity sufficient if the team is selected for the Phase I project?

ANSWER: A development team must form a legally recognized single business entity. See RFQ Part 1, page 15, paragraph 4.3.5 as in amendment 2.

49. QUESTION: Appendix D. OMB Scoring Guidance Paragraph 1.0 (page D-3). If occupancy rates of military personnel drop below a certain level, would the Army permit the developer to place non-service members (government civilians) and/or the public into unoccupied housing?

ANSWER: The Army will have a prioritized list of personnel eligible for assignment to privatized housing as part of CDMP development. Only after the list of all prioritized personnel waiting for housing has been exhausted will non-service affiliated individuals be considered for assignment.

50. QUESTION: Appendix D. OMB Scoring Guidance Paragraph 2.0 (page D-4). On the issue of loan guarantees, we understand an outright base closure or deployment of units. How would the Army define partial base closures, or downsizing for the purposes of such a loan guarantee?

ANSWER: The basis of a loan guarantee for a project will be based on the circumstances of the project and the expectations of risk associated with closing the Post, increasing or decreasing the military units stationed on the Post, and other similar factors. These will be determined and discussed during the development of the CDMP.

51. QUESTION: Reference: paragraph 2.1.3 CDMP OPS/MAINT 7 PROPERTY MGT PLAN. Please provide a greater explanation or an example of the Army's perception of "appropriate performance standards and incentives..." Section 2.1.3 refers to the components of the CDMP which will be developed in concert with the selected private sector partner. For purposes of the RFQ response, the Army expects the private partner to provide their vision of appropriate performance standards and incentives as outlined on page 12, section 4.3.1.

ANSWER: It is up to the development teams to include this in their proposals in accordance with their vision and their understanding of what it takes to operate, maintain, and manage a residential community/properties.

52. QUESTION: Reference: paragraph 3.1 "MHPI AUTHORITIES." From a Source Selection viewpoint, is it more or less advantageous to use the "four main financing tools?" Please explain the internal government relationship between using the MHPI legislation (financing tools) and the Source Selection grading/evaluation process.

ANSWER: Section 3.3, (RFQ page 9) and section 4.5.5, (RFQ page 22), explain the OMB scoring impact of the use of the various MHPI authorities.

53. QUESTION: Reference 3.3 OMB SCORING & APPENDIX D "OMB SCORING GUIDANCE." The explanation of OMB scoring and Appendix D implies/suggests that a model of some sort or a break-even analysis or economy study or cost expense trade-off algorithm of some sort is going to be applied to each bidder's cost/financing arrangement. As a responsible bidder, we are interested in utilizing the MHPI authorities but want to know when the use of the authorities has diminishing returns to the government. How do we understand the "sensitivities" of the OMB scoring so we can optimize our bid? If a model/equation/algorithm or other formulae exist, please provide them so we can optimize our proposal. Otherwise our proposal will not be capable of "maximizing total resources available for the Fort Meade project while minimizing the effect of OMB scoring on the Army's commitment of assets."

ANSWER: Section 3.3, (RFQ page 9), and section 4.5.5, (RFQ page 22), explain the OMB scoring impact of the use of the various MHPI authorities at an appropriate level for this of solicitation.

54. QUESTION. Reference 4.4 EVALUATION PROCESS & EVALUATION TEAM. Will bidder have an opportunity to comment on/refute information obtained from "additional communications from independent background analysis... third parties..."?

ANSWER: Yes, if discussions and clarifications are conducted.

55. QUESTION: Your assistance with answering the following question pertaining to the Fort Meade RFQ [RFQ # DACA02-00-R-0002] is appreciated:

a. Are the units at Old Meade Heights Currently occupied, or expected to be occupied by the time a developer takes control of the housing at Fort Meade?

b. Appendix B, table B-1 of the RFQ indicate that the total existing BAH at Fort Meade is predicated upon a total of 2,862 units, with a monthly total revenue potential of \$2,903,617 (based on the BAH rates for fiscal 2000). The RFQ, in

appendix B, also specifies that Old Meade Heights contains 250 units. The RFQ therefore seems to suggest that the 250 units at Old Meade Heights will be immediately be accounted for as part of the developer's revenue stream from existing BAH. We believe from our preliminary inspections and site visits that Old Meade Heights is sparsely or completely unoccupied.

c. If the units at Old Meade Heights are not occupied, will the BAH associated with the 250 units at this community be provided to the developer prior to redevelopment and occupancy of this community?

ANSWER: a. The majority of the units at Old Meade Heights are currently vacant and will probably not be occupied at the time the developer assumes responsibility for the Fort Meade Housing.

ANSWER: b. The developer will receive BAH for occupied units. Table B-1 is provided for illustrative purposes only.

ANSWER: c. BAH is provided to the developer only for those housing units occupied by a family authorized housing on the installation.

56. QUESTION: Can you please provide an itemization of the BAH by unit for Old Meade Heights so we may calculate the impact of the decreased revenue from the unoccupied units at Old Meade Heights.

ANSWER: The impact of demolition of Old Meade as part of the RCI project will be based on the plan, and timing of replacement housing units elsewhere on Post or at the same location. This will be determined during the development of the CDMP.

57. QUESTION: When is the bid due?

ANSWER: See RFQ Amendment 1 as applied to paragraph 1.2.2 on the <http://rci.army.mil> website, which extended the submission date to July 31, 2000, at 4:00 PM, EDT.

58. QUESTION: Is there a site that can provide me the list of respondents to the RFQ for both Fort Hood and Ft. Lewis and of that list what developer teams have made the first cut or short list?

ANSWER: No, this is protected data until the project(s) is awarded.

59. QUESTION: Are there set asides? I am an 8a HUB Zone construction contractor. May we negotiate a contract for carpentry, masonry, excavation or related trades ?

ANSWER: The Government is looking for a development team that meets the requirements of 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 of the RFQ. Any contract for work on-post housing will be awarded by the selected developer. See the RFQ at the <http://rci.army.mil> website.

60. QUESTION: In Part I, Section 4.2 (page 11), the first minimum requirement states that the primary developer must have ownership interest in at least 3 projects with 350 low-rise units **and** total development costs in excess of \$30 million. We want to verify that each project must meet **both** of these requirements. We would appreciate your timely response.

ANSWER: Each of the three project must have a minimum of 350 low-rise units and each must have a total development cost more than \$30 million. RFQ section 4.2. as written governs.